



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

59

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,332	11/30/2001	Christopher A. Johns	16010-06209	5145

758 7590 03/16/2005

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAO H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,332

Applicant(s)

JOHNS ET AL.

Examiner

Cao (Kevin) Nguyen

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final. *2nd*
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toga (US Patent No. 5,987,504) in view of Baker (US Patent No. 6,546,417).

Regarding claim 1, Toga discloses a method for reformatting messages for multiple display environments, the method receiving a message for introduction into the user interface, the message having a second format that differs from the first format such that introduction of the message unmodified would produce a misalignment according to the first display parameter (see col. 3, lines 25-60); and automatically reformatting the message to provide a reformatted message that corresponds with the first format; providing a display of the reformatted message

Art Unit: 2173

within the user interface, wherein the displayed reformatted message conforms to the first display parameter (see col. 4, lines 21-57); however, Toga fails to explicitly teach

Baker discloses determining provision of a user interface including a message display area having a first format that includes a first display parameter [..email program which includes and inbox list whereby different kinds of messages and attached document are displayed with different kinds of icons; see col. 4, lines 61-67]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide determining provision of a user interface including a message display area having a first format that includes a first display parameter as taught by Baker to the message delivering of Toga in order to pertain to a system for delivering data over a network. It pertains to the indirect transfer of information in response to an initial user operation.

Regarding claim 2, Toga discloses parameter, and the reformatted message conforms to the first display parameter and the second display parameter [see col. 2, lines 1-9].

Regarding claim 3, Toga discloses, wherein the first format further includes a second display parameter is a maximum number of display lines (see col. 3, lines 5-22).

Regarding claim 4, Toga discloses, wherein the first display parameter is a line length and the second receiving the line length and the maximum number of display lines; and re-flowing the message to provide a reformatted message having lines that correspond to the line length (see col. 3, lines 24-60).

Regarding claim 5, Baker discloses wherein re-flowing the message comprises: populating a current reformatted line within the reformatted message with a current line

Art Unit: 2173

from the message; and incrementing to a next reformatted line where insertion of an additional word from the current line would cause the current reformatted line to exceed the line length (see col. 12, lines 45-67).

Regarding claim 6, Toga discloses wherein re-flowing the message further comprises continuing to populate the current reformatted line with a next line from the message where the current line is exhausted before the current reformatted line exceeds the line length (see col. 4, lines 1-21).

Regarding claim 7, Baker discloses wherein re-flowing the message further comprises determining a paragraph break where the current line is exhausted and the current line is less than a predetermined minimum length (see col. 16, lines 29-67).

Regarding claim 8, Baker discloses wherein re-flowing the message further comprises determining a paragraph break where the current line is exhausted and a double line break is found before the next word in the message (see col. 7, lines 1-40).

Regarding claim 9, Baker discloses wherein the local system is a network based customer service system and the reformatted message is saved in a database used by the network based customer service system (see col. 9, lines 15-67).

As claim 10-18 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-9 above.

Claim 19 differs from claim 1 in that “an interface determination module, configured to determine provision of a user interface including a message display area having a first format that includes a first display parameter; a message buffer, configured to receive a message for

introduction into the user interface, the message having a second format that differs from the first format such that introduction of the message unmodified would produce a misalignment according to the first display parameter; and a reformatting module, in communication with the interface determining module and the message buffer, configured to automatically reformat the message to provide a reformatted message that corresponds with the first format, for provision of a display of the reformatted message within the user interface, wherein the displayed reformatted message conforms to the first display parameter” which read on Toga (see col. 3, lines 24-60 and col. 6, lines 13-64).

As claim 20-36 are analyzed as previously discussed with respected to claims 1-9 and 19 above.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (PTO-892).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cao (Kevin) Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-4053. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeza can be reached on (571)272-4018. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cao (Kevin) Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2173

03/11/05